

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AARON KEITH BENZIGER, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF LIVINGSTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00611-DAD-EPG
ORDER DENYING STIPULATED
PROTECTIVE ORDER
(ECF No. 14)

On December 8, 2020, the parties filed a Stipulated Protective Order. (ECF No. 14). The Court has reviewed the proposed protective order and finds that it does not comply with Eastern District of California Local Rule 141.1(c), which requires that every proposed protective order contain the following provisions: “(1) [a] description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child); (2) [a] showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and (3) [a] showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.” (paragraph breaks omitted).

The Court notes that this stipulation is nearly identical to the one filed on October 30, 2020. (*Compare* ECF No. 11 *with* ECF No. 14). In fact, the only change to the body of the

1 stipulation appears to be adding a few additional examples to the definition of “Confidential” in
2 section 2.2. This does not suffice.

3 Accordingly, the parties “Stipulated Protective Order for Standard Litigation” (ECF No.
4 14) is DENIED without prejudice to the parties’ ability to file a corrected stipulation and
5 proposed protective order.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: **December 9, 2020**

/s/ Eric P. Grogan
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE